GLENN O'CONNOR, B-71820	
Name and Prisoner/Booking Number CACIF. HEALTH CARE FACILITY	FILED
Place of Continement A BOX 32200	Dec 15, 2020 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
Mailing Address	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
City, State. Zip Code 4 4 4 4 5 3 13	-
(Failure to notify the Court of your change of address may result	in dismissal of this action.)
IN THE UNITED STATE FOR THE EASTERN DIS	TES DISTRICT COURT STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
GENN O'CONNOR (Full Name of Plaintiff) Plaintiff,))
V.	2:20-cv-2479-CKD (PC)
(I) CDCR	(To be supplied by the Clerk)
(Full Name of Defendant) (2) ALEV EARLY)
(2) 1100 × 171/01/171) CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT
(3)) BY A PRISONER
(4) ,) Poriginal Complaint
Defendant(s).) First Amended Complaint
Check if there are additional Defendants and attach page 1-A listing them.	Second Amended Complaint
A. JURI	SDICTION
1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursua	nt to:
28 U.S.C. § 1343(a); 42 U.S.C. § 1983	a a company
☐ 28 U.S.C. § 1331; <u>Bivens v. Six Unknow</u> ☐ Other:	n Federal Narcotics Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).
2. Institution/city where violation occurred: CHC	F, STOCKTON, CA.

B. DEFENDANTS

1. Name of first Defendant: CDR					
	(Position and Title) (Institution)				
2.	Name of second Defendant: ALEX FARHAT				
	(Position and Title) (Institution)				
3.	Name of third Defendant: The third Defendant is employed as: at				
	(Position and Title) (Institution)				
4.	Name of fourth Defendant: The fourth Defendant is employed as				
	(Position and Title) (Institution)				
If yo	u name more than four Defendants, answer the questions listed above for each additional Defendant on a separate page.				
	C. PREVIOUS LAWSUITS				
l.	Have you filed any other lawsuits while you were a prisoner?				
2.	If yes, how many lawsuits have you filed?				
	a. First prior lawsuit: 1. Parties: 6UENN O CONNOR 2. Court and case number: Unknown; CASE WAS FILED SOME 34 years ago 3. Result: (Was the case dismissed? Was it appealed? Is it still pending?) Al Smyssed for lack of prosecution				
	b. Second prior lawsuit: 1. Parties: 6LENN O'CONNON v. IN PEREZ et al 2. Court and case number: 18 DIST, FASTERN DISTRICT, # 2: 18-cv-01057 DIS 3. Result: (Was the case dismissed? Was it appealed? Is it still pending?) PENDING				
	c. Third prior lawsuit: 1. Parties: 6 LENN D'CONNUR v. CDCR 2. Court and case number: 15 DIST, EASTERN DIST, # 2:19-cv-658 KJM KJN 3. Result: (Was the case dismissed? Was it appealed? Is it still pending?) PENDING				

If you filed more than three lawsuits, answer the questions listed above for each additional lawsuit on a separate page.

	Case 2:20-cv-02479-KJM-CKD Document 1 Filed 12/15/20 Page 3 of 2
1	d) GLENN O'CONNOR V. PADGETT
2	US DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DIST, OF CALIF,
3	Case No. 2:19-cv-01926 DMC
4	STATUS: PENDING
5	
6	a) and alcount of Walley materials and
7	e) GLENN D'LONNOR V, KABIR MATHARY, etal
8	US DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF CARIF.
9	CASE No. 2:19-CV-2368 DMC
0	
1	STATUS: PENDING
2	
3	
4	f) GLENN O'CONNOR V. J. HOOKS, et al
5	US DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF CARIFI
6	Case No. 2:20-CV-135 CKD
7	
8	STATUS: PENDING
9	
0	G) GLENN D'CONNOR V. CDCR
1	US DIST, COURT, EAST, DIST, CAZIF.
2	DISI, COURT, EVISION DIST. WE EFB
3	CASE 16. 2:19-CV-1867 WBS EFB
24	STATUS; VOLUNTARILY WITH DEAWN
25	
26	
27	
28	
	(2a)

D. CAUSE OF ACTION

l.	Stat	the constitutional or other federal civil right that was violated: Eighth Amendment to the US Constitution
2.		im I. Identify the issue involved. Check only one. State additional issues in separate claims. Basic necessities □ Mail □ Access to the court ❷ Medical care Disciplinary proceedings □ Property □ Exercise of religion □ Retaliation Excessive force by an officer □ Threat to safety □ Other: □
3. Defauth	enua	pporting Facts. State as briefly as possible the FACTS supporting Claim I. Describe exactly what each nt did or did not do that violated your rights. State the facts clearly in your own words without citing legal or arguments. Please See Claim 1
	PL	AINTIFFS EYE DISEASE MAKES HIM PRINT LARGE - SO VEN IF THE PAGE NUMBERS ARE HIGH, THEY LOWTHIN ESS TEXT THAN MACHINE PREPARED BOCOMENTS.
	W	HICH MAKES IT VERY DIFFICULT TO HOLD A PEN OR TO PRINT LEGISLY.
4.	Inj	ury. State how you were injured by the actions or inactions of the Defendant(s). PLEASE SEE CLAIM
5.	Ad a.	ministrative Remedies: Are there any administrative remedies (grievance procedures or administrative appeals) available at your institution?
	b.	Did you submit a request for administrative relief on Claim I? Yes No
	c. d.	Did you appeal your request for relief on Claim I to the highest level? Yes No If you did not submit or appeal a request for administrative relief at any level, briefly explain why you did not.

1.	State the constitutional or other federal civil right that was violated: State the constitutional or other federal civil right that was violated: State the constitutional or other federal civil right that was violated:
2.	Claim II. Identify the issue involved. Check only one. State additional issues in separate claims. ☐ Basic necessities ☐ Mail ☐ Access to the court ☐ Medical care ☐ Disciplinary proceedings ☐ Property ☐ Exercise of religion ☐ Retaliation ☐ Excessive force by an officer ☐ Threat to safety ☐ Other:
3. Defauth	Supporting Facts. State as briefly as possible the FACTS supporting Claim II. Describe exactly what each ndant did or did not do that violated your rights. State the facts clearly in your own words without citing legal or try or arguments.
	Plaintiff suffers from eye disease (myopia) and finds it painful to try to write in these lines. All claims are worthen on the
	All Claims are written on The affected pages.
4.	Injury. State how you were injured by the actions or inactions of the Defendant(s).
5.	Administrative Remedies. a. Are there any administrative remedies (grievance procedures or administrative appeals) available at your institution? b. Did you submit a request for administrative relief on Claim II? Yes \(\subseteq \text{Yes} \subseteq \text{No.} \)
	 c. Did you appeal your request for relief on Claim II to the highest level? d. If you did not submit or appeal a request for administrative relief at any level, briefly explain why you did not.

1.	State	CLAIM III e the constitutional or other federal civil right that was violated: Shamondmont Lo US Constitution
2.		m III. Identify the issue involved. Check only one. State additional issues in separate claims. Basic necessities
3. Def auth	endai	porting Facts. State as briefly as possible the FACTS supporting Claim III. Describe exactly what each at did or did not do that violated your rights. State the facts clearly in your own words without citing legal or arguments. Please See previous fage
-		
4.	Inju	try. State how you were injured by the actions or inactions of the Defendant(s).
5.	Adı	ninistrative Remedies. Are there any administrative remedies (grievance procedures or administrative appeals) available at your institution?
	b.	Did you submit a request for administrative relief on Claim III? Yes \(\subseteq \) No
	c. d.	Did you appeal your request for relief on Claim III to the highest level? Yes No lif you did not submit or appeal a request for administrative relief at any level, briefly explain why you did not.

If you assert more than three Claims, answer the questions listed above for each additional Claim on a separate page.

E. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

State the relief you are seeking: In each claim except claim I injunctive relief prospective after screening mone fary Sums are mentioned:						
I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is Executed on	Olen	1 Poa	LAINTIFF			
(Name and title of paralegal, legal assistant, or other person who helped prepare this complaint)						
(Signature of attorney, if any)						
(Attorney's address & telephone number)						

ADDITIONAL PAGES

All questions must be answered concisely in the proper space on the form. If you need more space you may attach more pages, but you are strongly encouraged to limit your complaint to twenty-five pages. If you attach additional pages, be sure to identify which section of the complaint is being continued and number all pages. Remember, there is no need to attach exhibits to your complaint.

Complaint

OVERVIEW

Plaintiff is a convicted felon serving a sentence in the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR).

Plain tiff is currently housed at the California Health Care Facility, located in Stock ton, CA. (CHCF)

Plaintiff is a senior prisoner who suffers from a variety of medical conditions for which he has received treatments And protective services for many years, at many prisons.

Plaintiff suffers from sleep apnea, a potentially deadly condition if left untreated. The computerized Sleep Study conducted i'n 2014 evidenced plaintiff stopped breakhing some 9 times per hour of sleep, and plaintiff was prescribed a Continuous Pressure Airway Device (CAAP machine) to save his life.

Plaintiff suffers from Asthma / chronic a potentially deadly combination of diseases which have made plaintiff a high-risk respiratory patient, and made him be declared to be totally disabled by doctors at Several other prisons. Prisoners declared to be totally disabled are not made to work. To protect plaintiff from harm in the often filthy, dangerous, unsanitary prisons in California, plaintiff's doctors have historically initiated or maintained a Laundry-list of environmental and for work restrictions on Philhtiff, such as: Must not be exposed to pepper spray must not be exposed to chemicals, fumes from chemicals Must not be exposed to dust or dusty environments.

Must not be exposed to dust or dusty environments.

Must not be housed in a dorm (Single-cell status)

Must have continuous electrical power for his

Must be housed in a facility not high-risk for Valley Fever.

There are many more but for brevity, plaintiff will list only these. At every prison, the medical staff have initiated various restrictions and they, along with the Totally Disabled Status have rested to help protect plaintiff.

Plaintiff was diagnosed as hypersensitive to Chemicals in about 2016. Plaintiff's medical chronos at every prison have specified plaintiff must avoid chemicals, pepper spray, formes and Even cold or not temperatures.

Plaintiff's doctors have not yet been able to diagnose some of the serious symptoms
Plaintiff Suffers from; plaintiff has seen
Several specialists over the years and even

now has been awaiting seeing an allergist for all, or most of 2020. The could crisis has cancelled visits, even for medical care.

Plaintiff arrived at CHEF "for single-cell housing" (intake chrono) and has been single-celled through 2020.

Since arriving at CHCF, plaintiff has
required medically specialized housing (OHU)
Which provides higher levels of care than
plaintiff received elsewhere.

Plaintiff currently resides i'n a special 1-men cell with air handling capabilities to reduce any spread of infection in the respiratory system.

Plaintiff remains on 24-hour a day medical lockdown status.

(10)

28

Plaintiff is housed in C2A housing unit, where all the prisoners are single-celled due to their medical, or mental health, condition.

Dr. Alex Farhat is the Assigned Primary Gre Physician (PCP) for all patient / prisoners housed in C2A, C2A is deemed to be "OHV", or an Outpatient Housing Unit (Medical) as opposed to general population housing units.

Dissatisfied with what he perceived as poor medical care from Dr. Farhat, plaintiff filed several Inmate brilevances against him, and the issues surrounding his medical care.

In retaliation, Dr. Farhat Suddenly and Secretly changed plaintiff's status from totally disabled to "Light duty."

(11)

Plaintiff complained to Dr. Farhat that it appeared that all of the previously issued and maintained environmental and work restrictions had been removed from plaintiff's status and files. Dr. Farhat refused to discuss the topic and left the interview. Phintiff pereived a dangerous j'ob Assignment. Plaintiff filed a new Inmake Grievance against Dr. Farhat for the above.

Dr. Farhat Suddenly and secretly removed plain Liff's Single-cell status with no explanation. Dorm living has descented prount to be harmful to plain tiff.

Plaintiff therefore files the following claims:

(12)

CLAIM I

Plaintiff sues the CACR as it is the proper respondent for the injunctive relief plaintiff intends to seek after Screening by the court.

(13)

2

4 5

7

10

12

14

16

18

19

21

23

25 26

27 28 CLAIM II

Plaintiff sues defendant Alex Farhat in his in dividual capacity for violating plaintiffs rights to decent and adequate medical care under the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Defendant Farboit refused to order plaintiff be permitted to have a backup CPAP mask for use with his CPAP machine even though plaintiff had previously gone over 3 weeks without a mask when his mask broke during use.

During that 3 week period of time plaintiff Suffered untreated sleep appear symptoms which could have resulted in his death.

Plaintiff's request for a hack up comp mask was reasonable and a person in a similar circum stance to defendant Farhat would have made the medical order so as to protect plaintiff's health and life.

Complaint

(14)

Defendant Farhat's inaction in the face of pisk presented to him constituted Abandoning plaintiff, providing no medical care at all, and failing to protect plaintiff from a known and obvious risk.

For the deliberate in difference to a prisoner's serious medical needs, plaintiff seeks \$ 500,000.

(15)

CLAIM III AND STANDE

plaintiff sues defendant Alex Farhat in his individual capacity for viblating plaintiff's rights to decent and adequate medical care under the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Plaintiff complained that the prison did not replace the disposable filters for plaintiff's preseribed CPAP machine in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. The maker Stated the filters must be replaced every 30 days. The prison would only replace one every 180 days.

Plaintiff in farmed defendant Farhat that the disposable filter become clogged and dark in alor from absorbtion of dust, mites, and other particulants. Defendant Farhat denied plaintiffs request.

(16)

4 5

Case 2:20-cv-02479-KJM-CKD Document 1 Filed 12/15/20 Page 18 of 29

CLAIM III continuel

Plaintiff suffers from multiple serious lung diseases as well as sleep appea, And defendant Forhat was aware of this, as well as the facts that the CAAP machine pumped air into plaintiffs lungs continuously during use, and that the machine utilized filters which had to be changed regularly or harm to the patient could result. Plaintiff coughs hundreds of times daily.

Face of an obvious threat to plaintiffe health constituted about doing plaintiff, providing no medical care at all, and failing to protect plaintiff from a known and obvious pisk.

For de liberate indifférence to a prisoners serious health needs, plaintiff seeks \$ 10,000. on in compensatory damages.

(17

Complaint

- |

2

4 5 6

8

10

12 13

15

16

18

19 20

21 22

23

26

27

CLAIM IV

Plaintiff sues Afex Farhait in his individual capacity for violating plaintiffs nights under the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

defendant Farhat, without medical justification, Secretly changed plaintiffs status from totally disabled to Light Duty, resulting in plaintiff being assigned to a Building Porter [JANITOR] job which hurts him: porters are expected to Clean dust and use chemicals which are Viblative of philitiffs long-standing Medical orders. Plaintiff frees disciplinary charges for refusing to work in the harmful environmental conditions. Plaintiff seeks \$500,000,000 in compensatory damages.

(18)

CLAIM V

Plaintiff sues defendant Farhat for Violating his rights under the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Defindant Farhat Secretly and without medical virstification removed plaintiff single-cell Status even though plaintiff continues to suffer the exact same diseases and symptoms which caused plaintiff placement on that status.

Defendant Farkat, in apposition to plaintiff's diagnosed hypersensitivity to chemicals and even with the knowledge that plaintiff's pending Visit with a specialist has been repeatedly cancelled due to the covid-crisis, exposes plaintiff to the known and obvious risk of being housed (again) in darms, which is where he was housed when diagnosed.

(19)

Complaint

4 5

During a medical visit plaintiff reminded defendant Farhat that in all dorms the Prisoners possess and use chemicals including bleach, that employee-cleaners clean all the dorms with chemicals which are harmful to plaintiff, and that the dust from the other prisoner's unwashed blankets hurt plaintiff, as did their use of talcum or baby powder, which plaintiff Also had a medical warning not & to exposed to. Defendant Farhat refused to reinstate

Defendant Farhat ne losed to reinstate
plaintiff's single-cell status, abandoming
him, leaving him in a zone of danger
medically.

ampensatory damages.

complex'nt

(20)

2

4 5

7

9 10

11

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

22

23

2425

26

CLAIM VI

Plaintiff sues defendant Farhat in his individual capacity for violating phintiffs nights under the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

On a totality of circumstances theory, plaintiff alleges defendant fourhat violated his Eighth Amendment nights when he refused to provide decent and adequate medical care to plaintiff as outlined in curins II—II herein.

A) Defindant Farkat Cruelly densed plaintiffs' request that he be permitted to have a "back up" CPAP MASK, Since there is a history of the cheap, plastic MASKS the CDCR purchases, breaking during normal use. When a CPAP mask breaks, plaintiff would be deprived of the only treatment he receives for Sleep appear, a deadly disease if left untreased. Due to the last breakage, plaintiff had no sleep appear treatment for 3 weeks.

Complaint

4 5

B) Defindant FARTHAT cruelly denied plaintiff's pleas that the disposable filter used by his CAP machine be replaced in accordance with the User Manual provided to plaintiff by the Medical Staff.

Whereas the User Manual specifies the filter must be changed after 30 night's use, the prison only replaces it after 180 nights Use; the filter is clogged with dust and mites (microscopic Animals), dirt and other particulate matter. (Phintiff has studied sciences) The danger to phin HAL is that while he is unconscious the CAAP machine pumps air from the prison's atmosphere directly into plaintiff's lungs. Plaintiff suffers from multiple lung diseases, each could become dardly. Plaintiff must get on Complaint

the floor of his cell, on his hands and knees, and cough up copious Amount of mucous, mucous plugs, and phegin already due to the science emphysema (cops) he suffers. Plaintiff requires powerful, even dangerous medications, has suffered a lung operations to help him breath. For defendant Farhat to abandon plaintiff to breathing in dirty, intested air every night is shocking. C) Defendant Farhat, despite Knowledge that plaintiff was sent to CHCF for a higher level of care due to the severity of his 21 diseases, secretly and medically unjustifiedly Changed phintiff's work status from totally disabled to light duty.

23)

Camplainy

26 27

23

26

28

De sendant Farhat Knew that this change in status would cause plaintiff to be assigned to a job at a time when reporting to any job was beyond plaintiffs abilities and would be dangerous to his health.

Plaintiff informed defendant FARHAT that he had subsequently been a ssigned to a job as a Building Porter and that he was required to sweep dust, collect dust, dump trash cans and clean with chemicals in violation of his existing medical orders, Defendant Farhat cruelly refused to have plaintiff removed from the job which hurt him or to return him to totally disabled Status which would project him from harm.

D) Defindant Farhat Secretly and with no valid Medical justification removed plaintiffs

(24)

Single-cell status even though plaintiff still suffered from the debilitating medical conditions which caused him to be placed on that status to protect his health. Plaintiff has existing Medical orders to avoid dust, chemicals and talcom / baby powder, Upon being moved to a dorm plaintiff will immediately be subjected to dust, chemicals and powders: Plaintiff pleaded with the defendant that the other prisoners are permitted to use chemicals, detergents, baby powder. The other prisoners do not turn their dusty blankets in for laundering and they produce a cloud of dust with every inovement of the prisoners. Plaintiff pleaded with the defendant that the specialists he has seen (even recently) recommeded her be single-celled. Complaint

Plaintiff even complained to defendant that other prisoners messed with, tampered With, or threatened to sabotage plaintiffs CPAP machine, Plaintiff requires USAge of the CPAP every night, or, as the medical reports by other staff prove by computer printout, plaintiff is "100% compliant" with treatment, Defendant cruelly refused to reinstate the Plaintiff's single-cell status, leaving him in hear of any moment being moved to a dorn which is routinely cleaned by state employees with the chemicals plaintiff knows by history hurt him. E) Defendant Farhat consistently makes decisions Which are contrary to the decisions of plaintiffs doctors at the other prisons, and even obetas here at CHCF, harming plaintiff's health. 28

Complaint

(26)

Since plaintiff began filing grievances against defendant FARHAT, the defendant mysteriously failed to see plaintiff for his monthly Appointments. Doctors plaintiff had never been seen by and were un familiar with his Case showed up - only on that one day to see plaintiff. Plaintiff received no care 11 Whatsoever from those Stand-in doctors. G) Plaintiff's care has seriously faltered since being assigned to defendant FARHAT. Mainfiff 17 developed yet another bout of phvemonia under delendant FARHAT'S poor care. Plaintiff is now confined inside a special medical cell with special air handling abilities so other prisoners 23 are protected from plaintiffs' poor health. 25 Plain titt seeks 1,000;000.00 in ampensatory 26 damages from defendant FARHOT. 28

26

27

28

EXHAUSTRON OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

In accordance with the California lode of Regulations, Title 15, Division 3, & Article 5, Plaintiff filed Inmate Health Care brievances as to each claim herein. Each grievance was denied at the highest level of review:

CHCF HC 19002874, denied April 10, 2020,

#CHCF HC 2000555, denied July 1, 2020.

#CHEF HC 2000725, denied July 9, 2020.

#CHAF HC 2000175, denied September 22, 2020

#CHCF HC 2000 1456, (1456) denied NovEmber 19, 2020.

Defindants may access these grievances by reviewing plaintiff's electronically-stored prison file.

(38)